

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

Morris Anschel,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
vs.)	Civil Action No.: 4:10-cv-1651-TLW-TER
)	
Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P.,)	
)	
Defendant.)	
_____)	

ORDER

On June 25, 2010, the defendant, Edward D. Jones & Co., L.P. (“defendant”), removed this action to this Court based on federal question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331. (Doc. # 1). The plaintiff, Morris Anschel (“plaintiff”), alleges causes of action for violation of Title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VII), 42 U.S.C. § 2000(e) et seq., and age discrimination in violation of the Age Discrimination in Employment Act (ADEA), 29 U.S.C. § 621 et seq. (Doc. # 1, Attach. 1). The plaintiff also alleges state law causes of action for wrongful termination and retaliation, intentional infliction of emotional distress, and defamation.. (Doc. # 1, Attach. 1). An amended complaint asserting the same causes of action was filed on July 6, 2010. (Doc. # 9). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge Thomas E. Rogers, III pursuant to the provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1)(A) and (B) and Local Rule 73.02(B)(2), DSC.

This matter now comes before this Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (“the Report”) filed by the Magistrate Judge to whom this case had previously been assigned. (Doc. # 10). On October 12, 2010, the Magistrate Judge issued the Report. In the Report, the Magistrate Judge

recommends that the defendant's motion to dismiss and compel arbitration or, in the alternative, stay the action and compel arbitration (Doc. # 7) be granted and that this case be dismissed. (Doc. # 10). The plaintiff did not file a response to the defendant's motion or file objections to the report. Objections were due on October 29, 2010.

This Court is charged with conducting a de novo review of any portion of the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation to which a specific objection is registered, and may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendations contained in that report. 28 U.S.C. § 636. In the absence of objections to the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge, this Court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

The Court has carefully reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and Recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** that the Magistrate Judge's Report is **ACCEPTED**. (Doc. # 10). For the reasons articulated by the Magistrate Judge, the defendant's motion to dismiss and compel arbitration or, in the alternative, stay the action and compel arbitration (Doc. # 7) is **GRANTED** and this action is **DISMISSED**.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Terry L. Wooten
United States District Judge

January 20, 2011
Florence, South Carolina